



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/433,497	11/03/1999	THIRU SRINIVASAN	1613(42059-0	2641

20350 7590 05/23/2003

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

FERRIS, DERRICK W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2663

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/433,497

Applicant(s)

SRINIVASAN, THIRU

Examiner

Derrick W. Ferris

Art Unit

2663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. **Claims 28-41** as amended are still in consideration for this application. Applicant has added claims 28-41. Please note that the Office has renumbered claims 29-42 as 28-41 (since claim 2 was never filed). **Please use the new numbering scheme for the remainder of prosecution.**
2. Examiner **withdraws** the 112-second paragraph rejection for Office action filed 12/12/02 in reference to line item 2-3. As applicant canceled the claims, the rejection is now moot and is thus withdrawn.
3. Examiner **withdraws** the anticipated rejection to *Nadeau '449* but **not** the obviousness rejection to *Nadeau '449*. Examiner disagrees with applicant's comments concerning the reference and has thus provided a new rejection for the claims as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. **Claim 29** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The dependency for claim 29 is unclear since applicant has canceled claim 20. Examiner assumes applicant meant claim 28 as the base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 28-41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,161,128 to *Smyk* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,449 to *Nadeau* and U.S. Patent No. 6,021,126 to *White et al.* ("*White*").

As to **claims 28 and 34**, *Smyk* discloses a clearer picture of how subscriber servers are created (i.e., added/deleted/modified) using a web front-end. As noted in the Background (and illustrated in Figure 1), the prior art taught that an AIN subscriber previously had to use either a service representative 107 or an IP 103 through SSP 102 to make changes to service [column 1, lines 55-65]. *Smyk* teaches that a web front-end can also be used to make changes to service as shown in figure 2. Specifically shown in the figure is an AIN subscriber 201 connected to the Internet 202 makes changes to service through an Internet gateway 203 via a web server 204. Not clearly disclosed by the reference is where the database is for storing subscriber information (i.e., the back-end database) such as the database for the SPACE application 206 [emphasis column 6, lines 27-47]. Shown in figure 3 is slightly more detail concerning the back-end interface 302 and application interface 301 for the web server 204. For example, the SPACE application 206 generates call processing records (CPR) and stores them in a database associated therewith. The SPACE application 206 can be used for entering and storing

Art Unit: 2663

service subscriber subscription data (e.g., profile information as referred to by *Nadeau*) and is the service creation and provisioning tool of the ISCP/node 205 [column 6, lines 28-44].

Examiner notes the reference is silent or deficient to where the database resides (i.e., the subscriber information database) accessible by the SCP (through the ISCP/Node 205). Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan prior to applicant's invention to implement a subscriber information database also on a packet network (e.g., a data network). One motivation might be to facilitate the programming interface between the web server and database such that both use IP allowing for easy integration between a web server's interface and database (since both operate over IP). As support, examiner notes *Nadeau* discloses that the subscriber information database is on a packet network (e.g., data network) and also allows subscribers to access their profiles through a web browser [column 10, lines 23-30]. Examiner also notes further support taught by *White* showing a database 35 in figure 3 used to contain subscriber information used to route calls from a PSTN as illustrated in figure 4 (examiner notes that *White* is silent or deficient to how the database is populated which is taught by *Smyk* and as is known in the art). Thus with respect to the claim language, *Smyk* discloses a web server 204 used to communicate with a service control point in a telephonic network. Taught by *White* is a database 35 (i.e., subscriber information database) accessible by the SCP so as to provided telephonic routing (e.g., local number portability) in response to a detected attempt to connect with a destination address at the SCP. Shown by *Smyk* is at least one interactive screen display presentable to system users (i.e., AIN subscribers)

Art Unit: 2663

accessing the network over the data network wherein the interactive screen displays are configured such that the system users may add, amend and/or delete routing addresses and information associated with one or more destination addresses stored in the subscriber information base (e.g., figure 5 of *Smyk*).

As all three references have to do with telephone networks in general, and more specifically, interaction between a telephone network and a data network, examiner notes a strong motivation to combine the subject matter for all three references.

As to **claim 29**, *Smyk* and *Nadeau* both disclose using web browsers [e.g., *Smyk* column 5, lines 47-63].

As to **claims 30, 31, and 33**, *Nadeau* discloses general information stored in a subscriber database such as a subscriber number and date routing. Also mentioned is information pertaining to pager related calls such that it would have been obvious to also include information also regarding pager unavailability. One motivation might be a general time of day that a subscriber is not available to take pages.

As to **claim 32**, all three references disclose an AIN network

As to **claim 35**, all three references disclose the Internet.

As to **claim 36**, see the rejection for claim 31.

As to **claim 37**, as *Nadeau* discloses time of day routing, examiner notes that it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan prior to applicant's invention to calculate the difference between the geographical location and the destination address. One motivation might be that the database is in a different time zone than the subscriber such that

Art Unit: 2663

the location of the subscriber also needs to be kept in consideration when determining the time of day.

As to **claim 38-41**, *Smyk* discloses presenting an interactive screen. Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan prior to applicant's invention to present an input field (i.e., user interaction) for each field in the subscriber database such as the information presented by *Nadeau* and as disclosed in the rejection for claims 30,31, and 33.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Derrick W. Ferris whose telephone number is (703) 305-4225. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9 A.M. - 4:30 P.M. E.S.T.


Art Unit: 2663

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on (703) 308-5340. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 305-3900.

Derrick W. Ferris
Examiner
Art Unit 2663


DWF
May 19, 2003


MELVIN MARCELO
PRIMARY EXAMINER